Constraining spacetime noncommutativity with primordial nucleosynthesis

Raul Horvat[1] and Josip Trampetić[2]

[1] *Physics Division, Rudjer Bošković Institute, Zagreb, Croatia*
[2] *Theoretical Physics Division, Rudjer Bošković Institute, Zagreb, Croatia*

(Dated: April 1, 2009)

We discuss a constraint on the scale $\Lambda_{\rm NC}$ of noncommutative (NC) gauge field theory arising from consideration of the big bang nucleosynthesis (BBN) of light elements. The propagation of neutrinos in the NC background described by an antisymmetric tensor $\theta^{\mu\nu}$ does result in a tree-level vector-like coupling to photons in a generation-independent manner, raising thus a possibility to have an appreciable contribution of three light right-handed (RH) fields to the energy density of the universe at nucleosynthesis time. Considering elastic scattering processes of the RH neutrinos off charged plasma constituents at a given cosmological epoch, we obtain for a conservative limit on an effective number of additional doublet neutrinos, $\Delta N_\nu = 1$, a bound $\Lambda_{\rm NC} \gtrsim 3$ TeV. With a more stringent requirement, $\Delta N_\nu \lesssim 0.2$, the bound is considerably improved, $\Lambda_{\rm NC} \gtrsim 10^3$ TeV. For our bounds the θ-expansion of the NC action stays always meaningful, since the decoupling temperature of the RH species is perseveringly much less than the inferred bound for the scale of noncommutativity.

PACS numbers: 11.10.Nx, 12.38.-t, 26.35.+c

arXiv:0901.4253v2 [hep-ph] 1 Apr 2009

Our main motivation to discuss a constraint on the scale of noncommutative (NC) gauge field theory [1], $\Lambda_{\rm NC}$, arising from the big bang nucleosynthesis (BBN) of light elements is physically first due to the possibility of a direct coupling of neutral particles to gauge bosons in the NC background [2]. Such a background plays the role of an external field in the theory. It will imply only a vector-like coupling between photons and neutrinos in a U(1) gauge-invariant way, thus endowing otherwise sterile right-handed (RH) neutrino components a new interaction. This makes the early universe nucleosynthesis a perfect arena to set a constraint for this interaction, giving us in turn a bound on $\Lambda_{\rm NC}$ if neutrinos are Dirac particles. The coupling of matter fields to Abelian gauge bosons is a NC analogue of the usual minimal coupling scheme. It is possible to extend the model [2] to the NC electroweak model based on the other gauge groups [4, 5]. Second reason is that the NC version of standard model (SM) [4] appears to be anomaly free [6] and it does have remarkable well behaved one-loop quantum corrections [7], as well as some other models do [8, 9]. Third is that such models [1]-[5], up to first order in θ-expansion and up to one-loop, do not lead to a violation of a dispersion relation for a quanta propagating in the vacuum [8, 10]; they however do break Lorentz symmetry.

The NC gauge theory that we use belongs to a class of models that expand the NC action in θ *before* quantization [1]. These models differs fundamentally from other approaches [11, 12, 13] based on star($\star$)-products that are not θ-expanded and do not use the enveloping algebra and the Seiberg-Witten (SW) map [3]. Note here that the $\star$-product, a non-local bilinear expression in the fields and their derivatives, takes the form of a series in antisymmetric tensor $\theta^{\mu\nu}$. The models very nicely capture new interactions and violations of spacetime symmetries induced by noncommutativity.

In the model of ref. [2] Seiberg–Witten maps are necessary to express the noncommutative fields $\widehat{\psi}$, $\widehat{A}_\mu$, (and their derivatives) that appear in the action and transform under NC gauge transformations, in terms of their asymptotic commutative counterparts ψ and A_μ.

So, we choose a perturbative approach to the NC gauge field theory in which the action is expanded in powers of a Poisson tensor $\theta^{\mu\nu}$ defined via $\star$-commutator, $x^\mu \star x^\nu - x^\nu \star x^\mu = ih\theta^{\mu\nu}$. Here, the noncommutative deformation parameter $h = 1/\Lambda^2_{\rm NC}$ fix the NC scale, while the $\theta^{\mu\nu}$ is dimensionless tensor with the square of matrix elements of order one.

That model is meant to provide an effective description of spacetime noncommutativity involving the photon–neutrino contact interaction [2]. It describes the scattering of particles that enter from an asymptotically commutative region into the NC interaction region.

Neutrinos do not carry an electromagnetic charge and hence do not directly couple to photons, at least not in a commutative setting. In the presence of spacetime noncommutativity, it is, however, possible to couple neutral particles to photons via a $\star$-commutator. The relevant NC covariant derivative expanded to the lowest order read

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{D}_\mu\widehat{\psi} &= \partial_\mu\widehat{\psi} - i\kappa e\widehat{A}_\mu \star \widehat{\psi} + i\kappa e\widehat{\psi}\star\widehat{A}_\mu \\ &= \partial_\mu\widehat{\psi} + \kappa e h\theta^{\nu\rho}\,\partial_\nu\widehat{A}_\mu\,\partial_\rho\widehat{\psi}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

with the $\star$-product and a coupling κe that corresponds to a multiple (or fraction) κ of the electric charge e.

To the order considered in this report, κ can be absorbed in a rescaling of the deformation parameter h. The $\star$-product is associative but, in general, not commutative; otherwise the proposed coupling to the NC photon field $\widehat{A}_\mu$ would of course be zero.

In the first equation of (1), one may think of the NC neutrino field $\widehat{\psi}$ as having left charge $+\kappa e$, right charge $-\kappa e$ and total charge zero. From the perspective of non-Abelian gauge theory, one could also say that the neutrino field is charged in a noncommutative analogue of the adjoint representation with the matrix multiplication replaced by the $\star$-product. For this model where only the neutrino has dual left and right charges, $\kappa = 1$ is required by the gauge invariance of the action.

From a geometric point of view, photons do not directly couple to the "bare" commutative neutrino fields, but rather modify the NC background.

Concerning the physics to be investigated, the picture that we have in mind is that of a spacetime that has a continuous 'commutative' description at low energies and long distances, but a NC structure at high energies and short distances. At high energies we can model spacetime using $\star$-products. This description is expected not to be valid at low energies. The technical consequence is that we expand up to a certain order in θ and consider renormalization of this truncated theory up to the same order in θ [7, 8, 9]. It is obvious that in this truncated theory no UV/IR mixing effects would appear [12]. This reflects very well our assumption: At low energies and large distances the noncommutative theory has to be modified.

The action for a neutral fermion that couples to an Abelian gauge boson in the NC background is:

$$S = \int d^4x \left(\overline{\widehat{\psi}} \star i\gamma^\mu \widehat{D}_\mu \widehat{\psi} - m\overline{\widehat{\psi}} \star \widehat{\psi} \right) . \qquad (2)$$

Here $\widehat{\psi} = \psi + eh\theta^{\nu\rho} A_\rho \partial_\nu \psi$ is the NC "chiral" fermion field expanded by the "chiral" SW map and $\widehat{A}_\mu = A_\mu + eh\theta^{\rho\nu} A_\nu \left[\partial_\rho A_\mu - \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu A_\rho\right]$ is the Abelian NC gauge potential expanded by the ordinary SW map. Note that a "chiral" Seiberg-Witten map is compatible with grand unified models where fermion multiplets are chiral [5]. The above action is gauge-invariant under the noncommutative U(1)-gauge transformations.

After the SW and the $\star$-product expansions we obtain the following electromagnetically gauge-invariant action at order h for photons and neutrinos in terms of commutative fields and parameters:

$$S = \int d^4x \bar{\psi} \Big[(i\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu - m) - \frac{e}{2} h A_{\mu\nu} \left(i\theta^{\mu\nu\rho}\partial_\rho - \theta^{\mu\nu} m \right) \Big] \psi , \quad (3)$$

with $\theta^{\mu\nu\rho} = \theta^{\mu\nu}\gamma^\rho + \theta^{\nu\rho}\gamma^\mu + \theta^{\rho\mu}\gamma^\nu$. It is interesting to note that for the massless case, Eq. (3) reduces to the coupling between the stress–energy tensor of a neutrino $T^{\mu\nu}$ and the symmetric tensor composed of $\theta^{\mu\nu}$ and $A_{\mu\nu}$. This nicely illustrates our assertion that we are seeing the interaction of the neutrino with a modified photon–θ background. In the above we have $A_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu$.

From (3) we extract the following Feynman rule for massless left(right)-handed neutrinos (the same for each generation) [2]:

$$\Gamma^\mu_{\binom{\mathrm{L}}{\mathrm{R}}}(\nu(k)\nu(k')\gamma(q)) \;=\; ieh\frac{1}{2}(1 \mp \gamma_5)\theta^{\mu\nu\rho} k_\nu q_\rho \ , \quad (4)$$

where $k = k' + q$. Before starting computation of relevant Feynman diagrams some important comments are in order. When calculating S-matrix elements, one ordinarily uses the LSZ formalism, which is constructed by using Lorentz invariance and implies that S-matrix elements are obtained by identifying the poles in momentum space of some Green functions. This happens at points satisfying the Lorentz invariant constraint $p^2 = m^2$. In NC spacetime Lorentz invariance is broken, which means that the poles of Green functions need not satisfy the constraint $p^2 = m^2$; a θ-dependence may appear and then one should be more careful when computing S-matrix elements [29]. Since we have to compute only S-matrix elements (amplitudes) at tree level and only up to first order in θ, the usual way of deriving matrix elements remains valid.

Signatures of noncommutativity and/or the bounds on the NC scale come from neutrino astrophysics [2, 14, 15], high energy particle physics [16, 17, 18], as well as from other low energy nonaccelerator experiments [19]. The bound from $Z \to \gamma\gamma$ decay on Λ_{NC}, of order a few TeV [17], is the most robust due to the finite one-loop quantum corrections of the gauge sector of the nmNCSM [7]. In the following we are going to place, for the first time, a bound on the spacetime noncommutativity from cosmology, by making use of the BBN restriction on the number of neutrino species.

For several past decades, the BBN has established itself as one of the most powerful available probes of physics beyond the SM, giving many interesting constraints on particle properties (an extensive summary is available, for instance, in [20]). The BBN had begun to play a central role in constraining particle properties since the seminal paper of Steigman, Schramm and Gunn [21], in which the observation-based determination of the primordial abundance of ^{4}He was used for the first time to constrain the number of light neutrino species. Later, with the inclusion of other light element abundances (D, ^{3}He and ^{7}Li) and their successful agreement with the theoretically predicted abundances, many aspects of physics beyond SM can have been further constrained [22].

One uses to parametrize the energy density of new relativistic particles at the time of BBN in terms of the effective additional number of neutrino species, ΔN_ν, whose determination requires both a lower limit to the baryon-to-photon ratio ($\eta \equiv n_b/n_\gamma$) and an upper bound for the primordial mass fraction of ^{4}He, Y_p [23]. By increasing ΔN_ν increases the Hubble expansion rate, causing higher freeze-out temperature for the weak interaction reactions and therefore larger neutron fraction, resulting eventu-

ally in a larger value of Y_p. With the WMAP value for η [24], Y_p was predicted to increase [25], having a tendency to loosen the tight bounds on ΔN_ν that existed before. With a recent reanalysis [26] of the observed primordial ^{4}He abundance, and its uncertainties, even the higher mean value for Y_p was predicted (0.2495). Consequently, the limits to ΔN_ν get relaxed. Therefore, in our analysis $\Delta N_\nu = 1$ will be employed as a central value to constrain nonstandard physics, a marginally conservative limit for the assessment [26].

The energy density of 3 light RH neutrinos during the BBN is equivalent to the effective number ΔN_ν of additional doublet neutrinos

$$\Delta N_\nu = \sum_{i=1}^{3} \frac{g_i}{2} \left(\frac{T_{\nu_R}}{T_{\nu_L}} \right)^4 , \tag{5}$$

where the number of spin degrees of freedom $g_i = 2$ and T_{ν_L} is the temperature of the SM neutrinos, being the same as that of photons down to $T \sim 1$ MeV. Hence we have

$$3 \left(\frac{T_{\nu_R}}{T_{\nu_L}} \right)^4 \lesssim \Delta N_{\nu,max} . \tag{6}$$

How the temperature of ν_Rs, decoupled at T_{dec}, relates to the temperature of still interacting ν_Ls below T_{dec}, stems easily from the fact that the entropy in the decoupled species and the entropy in the still interacting ones are separately conserved. The ratio of the temperatures is a function of T_{dec}, and is given by [27] [30]

$$\frac{T_{\nu_R}}{T_{\nu_L}} = \left[\frac{g_{*\nu_R}(T_{dec})}{g_{*\nu_R}(T_{\nu_L})} \frac{g_{*S}(T_{\nu_L})}{g_{*S}(T_{dec})} \right]^{1/3} , \tag{7}$$

where $g_{*\nu_R}$ and g_{*S} are the degrees of freedom specifying the entropy of the decoupled and of the interacting species, respectively [20, 28]. Now, combining (6) with (7) and noting that at the time of BBN $g_{*S}(\sim MeV) = 10.75$, one arrives at

$$g_{*S}(T_{dec}) \gtrsim \frac{24.5}{(\Delta N_{\nu,max})^{3/4}} . \tag{8}$$

With the conservative bound $\Delta N_{\nu,max} = 1$, (8) implies $g_{*S}(T_{dec}) > 24.5$ which in turn enforces $T_{dec} > T_C$, where T_C is the critical temperature for the deconfinement restoration phase transition, $T_C \sim 200$ MeV.

Using the nonstandard $\bar{\nu}\nu\gamma$ vertex as given by (4), the cross section for scattering of the RH neutrino off a charged fermion (with a charge e) in the early universe is calculated to be

$$\sigma_{scatt} \simeq 36\, \alpha^2 \frac{E^2}{\Lambda_{\rm NC}^4} , \tag{9}$$

where α is the fine-structure constant. A remark is in order regarding arrival to (9). The forward scattering gives rise to a logarithmic singularity, $\ln(q_{max}/q_{min})$, which we regularize by using a Debye mass, $q_{min} = m_{el} \simeq eT/\sqrt{3}$. Also, the mass of the charged fermion is neglected in (9).

The RH neutrino is commonly considered to decouple at the temperature T_{dec} when the condition

$$\Gamma_{scatt}(T_{dec}) \simeq H(T_{dec}) , \tag{10}$$

is satisfied. Here $\Gamma_{scatt} = < n_{scatt}\ \sigma_{scatt}\ v >$ is the thermally-averaged scattering rate, and expansion rate of the universe in the radiation-dominated epoch is given by

$$H \simeq 1.66\, g_*^{1/2} \frac{T^2}{M_{Pl}} , \tag{11}$$

where T denotes a common temperature for the interacting species. Here g_* counts degrees of freedom specifying the energy density and coincides with g_{*S} always when particle species have a common temperature.

Using $n_{scatt} \simeq 0.18\, T^3$, $E \simeq 9\, T$ and σ_{scatt} from (9), we obtain the following decoupling temperature

$$T_{dec} \simeq 0.5\, \alpha^{-2/3} M_{Pl}^{-1/3} \Lambda_{\rm NC}^{4/3} . \tag{12}$$

Now, by imposing a constraint $T_{dec} > T_C \sim 200$ MeV, and counting all charged fermions present in the cosmological epoch between T_C and a neighboring quark mass above T_C, we find $\Lambda_{\rm NC} \gtrsim 3$ TeV. With the inclusion of electrons, muons and s quarks, this is our result based on the conservative bound $\Delta N_{\nu,max} = 1$.

A new analysis of the ^{4}He abundance [26], indicating a shift in the mean value of Y_p, quoted also a relaxed limits to ΔN_ν compared to those that had existed before (for a review see again [20]). This also diminishes a potential for BBN to constrain nonstandard physics, reducing also our bound on $\Lambda_{\rm NC}$. One can hope that constant effort in improving the precision of the observation of primordial abundances of light elements will result in tighten limits to ΔN_ν once again. This would also have important consequences for our bound too. For instance, $\Delta N_\nu \lesssim 0.2$ would enforce T_{dec} close to a critical temperature of the electroweak phase transition, $T_{dec} \lesssim 300$ GeV, implying in turn a significantly better limit, $\Lambda_{\rm NC} \gtrsim 10^3$ TeV. This limit purports inclusion of all the charged leptons and quarks (as seen from the Table 1. in [20]).

Finally, a remark on the consistency of our approach is in order. As seen from (4), the perturbative expansion in terms of the scale of noncommutaivity $\Lambda_{\rm NC}$ retains its meaningful character only if $E^2/\Lambda_{\rm NC}^2 \lesssim 1$, where E is the characteristic energy for a process. For a cosmological setting, as given above, this translates to $T_{dec}^2/\Lambda_{\rm NC}^2 \lesssim 1$. Our bounds always fulfill this constraint.

In conclusion, we have demonstrated how the BBN bounds on the scale of spacetime noncommutativity appear among the best ones even for large errors inherent in observation of primordial abundances of light elements,

which sensibly diminishes the potential of the method. We have also shown that with improving the precision of observation, the BBN bounds could easily become the strongest restriction on the scale of noncommutativity.

Acknowledgement

The work of R.H. and J.T. are supported by the Croatian Ministry of Science, Education and Sports under Contract Nos. 0098-0982930-2872 and 0098-0982930-2900, respectively. The work of J. T. is in part supported by the EU (HEPTOOLS) project under contract MRTN-CT-2006-035505.

[1] J. Madore, S. Schraml, P. Schupp and J. Wess, Eur. Phys. J. C **16** (2000) 161 [arXiv:hep-th/0001203]; B. Jurco, S. Schraml, P. Schupp and J. Wess, Eur. Phys. J. C **17** (2000) 521 [arXiv:hep-th/0006246]; B. Jurco, L. Moller, S. Schraml, P. Schupp and J. Wess, Eur. Phys. J. C **21** (2001) 383 [arXiv:hep-th/0104153].

[2] P. Schupp, J. Trampetic, J. Wess and G. Raffelt, Eur. Phys. J. C **36**, 405 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0212292].

[3] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, JHEP **9909**, 032 (1999) [arXiv:hep-th/9908142].

[4] X. Calmet, B. Jurco, P. Schupp, J. Wess and M. Wohlgenannt, Eur. Phys. J. C **23** (2002) 363 [arXiv:hep-ph/0111115]; B. Melic, K. Passek-Kumericki, J. Trampetic, P. Schupp and M. Wohlgenannt, Eur. Phys. J. C **42** (2005) 483 [arXiv:hep-ph/0502249]; ibid. 499 [arXiv:hep-ph/0503064]; W. Behr, N. G. Deshpande, G. Duplancic, P. Schupp, J. Trampetic and J. Wess, Eur. Phys. J. C **29** (2003) 441 [arXiv:hep-ph/0202121].

[5] P. Aschieri, B. Jurco, P. Schupp and J. Wess, Nucl. Phys. B **651**, 45 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0205214].

[6] C. P. Martin, Nucl. Phys. B **652** (2003) 72 [arXiv:hep-th/0211164]. F. Brandt, C. P. Martin and F. R. Ruiz, JHEP **0307**, 068 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0307292].

[7] M. Buric, V. Radovanovic and J. Trampetic, JHEP **0703** (2007) 030 [arXiv:hep-th/0609073].

[8] A. Bichl, J. Grimstrup, H. Grosse, L. Popp, M. Schweda and R. Wulkenhaar, JHEP **0106** (2001) 013 [arXiv:hep-th/0104097].

[9] D. Latas, V. Radovanovic and J. Trampetic, Phys. Rev. D **76** (2007) 085006 [arXiv:hep-th/0703018]; C. P. Martin and C. Tamarit, Phys. Lett. B **658**, 170 (2008) [arXiv:0706.4052 [hep-th]]; M. Buric, D. Latas, V. Radovanovic and J. Trampetic, Phys. Rev. D **77** (2008) 045031 [arXiv:0711.0887 [hep-th]].

[10] M. M. Ettefaghi and M. Haghighat, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 056009 (2008) [arXiv:0712.4034 [hep-ph]].

[11] M. Chaichian, P. Presnajder, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari and A. Tureanu, Eur. Phys. J. C **29**, 413 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0107055].

[12] C. P. Martin and D. Sanchez-Ruiz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 476 (1999) [arXiv:hep-th/9903077]; A. Matusis, L. Susskind and N. Toumbas, JHEP **0012**, 002 (2000) [arXiv:hep-th/0002075]; P. Schupp and J. You, JHEP **0808**, 107 (2008) [arXiv:0807.4886 [hep-th]].

[13] S. A. Abel, J. Jaeckel, V. V. Khoze and A. Ringwald, JHEP **0609** (2006) 074 [arXiv:hep-ph/0607188].

[14] P. Minkowski, P. Schupp and J. Trampetic, Eur. Phys. J. C **37**, 123 (2004) [arXiv:hep-th/0302175].

[15] M. Haghighat, arXiv:0901.1069 [hep-ph].

[16] B. Melic, K. Passek-Kumericki and J. Trampetic, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 054004 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0503133]; ibid 057502 [arXiv:hep-ph/0507231]; C. Tamarit and J. Trampetic, arXiv:0812.1731 [hep-th], to appear in PRD.

[17] M. Buric, D. Latas, V. Radovanovic and J. Trampetic, Phys. Rev. D **75** (2007) 097701 [arXiv:hep-ph/0611299]; J. Trampetic, Fortsch. Phys. **56**, 521 (2008) [arXiv:0802.2030 [hep-ph]].

[18] A. Alboteanu, T. Ohl and R. Ruckl, Phys. Rev. D **74** (2006) 096004 [arXiv:hep-ph/0608155]; Phys. Rev. D **76** (2007) 105018 [arXiv:0707.3595 [hep-ph]]; J. A. Conley and J. L. Hewett, arXiv:0811.4218 [hep-ph].

[19] S. M. Carroll, J. A. Harvey, V. A. Kostelecky, C. D. Lane and T. Okamoto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 141601 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0105082]; C. E. Carlson, C. D. Carone and R. F. Lebed, Phys. Lett. B **518**, 201 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0107291]; A. Anisimov, T. Banks, M. Dine and M. Graesser, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 085032 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0106356].

[20] S. Sarkar, Rep. Prog. Phys **59** (1996) 1493.

[21] G. Steigman, D. N. Schramm and J. E. Gunn, Phys. Lett. B **66**, 202 (1977).

[22] R. A. Malaney and G. J. Mathews, Phys. Rept. **229**, 145 (1993).

[23] K. A. Olive, D. N. Schramm, G. Steigman, M. S. Turner and J. M. Yang, Astrophys. J. **246**, 557 (1981).

[24] D. N. Spregel et al., Astrophys. J. Suppl. **148** (2003) 175.

[25] R. H. Cyburt, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 023505 (2004) [arXiv:astro-ph/0401091].

[26] R. H. Cyburt, B. D. Fields, K. A. Olive and E. Skillman, Astropart. Phys. **23**, 313 (2005) [arXiv:astro-ph/0408033].

[27] M. Srednicki, R. Watkins and K. A. Olive, Nucl. Phys. B **310**, 693 (1988): P. Gondolo and G. Gelmini, Nucl. Phys. B **360**, 145 (1991).

[28] E. W. Kolb and M. S. Turner, The Early Universe, Redwood City, CA, Addison-Wesley (1990).

[29] However, the NC quantum correction to the photon self-energy, i.e. the effects of birefringence, as well as NC modifications of the neutrino propagator, start to appear as late as at the 2nd order in θ-expansion [8, 10, 13]. So, to first order in θ-expansion, the one-loop quantum correction shows that the photon and neutrino propagators still have poles of the ordinary type.

[30] Note that while $g_{*\nu_R}$ does not change following decoupling, which is certainly the case for light neutrinos in our consideration, the ratio (7) acquires a more familiar form $\frac{T_{\nu_R}}{T_{\nu_L}} = \left[\frac{g_{*S}(T_{\nu_L})}{g_{*S}(T_{dec})}\right]^{1/3}$.